



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,528	06/25/2001	Michael A. Ekhaus	2222.0730001	5737

26111 7590 02/19/2008  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

TARAE, CATHERINE MICHELLE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/19/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/887,528

**Applicant(s)**

EKHAUS ET AL.

**Examiner**

C. Michelle Tarae

**Art Unit**

3623

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 27 and 35-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9, 10, 19, 27 and 35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-18 and 36-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-884)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 6, 2007 has been entered.

Claims 20-26 and 28-34 have been previously canceled.

Claims 9, 10, 19, 27 and 35 have been previously withdrawn from further consideration.

Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 14-18 and 36-41 have been amended.

Claims 1-19, 27 and 35-41 are now pending in this application.

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 36-41 are rejected below.

### ***Response to Amendments***

2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 4-8, 11, 14-18 and 36-41 are acknowledged.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found persuasive. In the Remarks, Applicant argues a similar argument to the previous response, which is that Sheena does not teach or suggest at least "wherein said user's selected

preferences are represented as binary data in said sparse unary ratings matrix," as recited in independent claim 1, "wherein said sparse unary ratings matrix includes ratings data represented as binary data" as recited in independent claim 11, or "a unary array of entries that can be arithmetically manipulated, wherein data in the unary array of entries is binary data".

In response to the argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. To support Applicant's argument, Applicant cites to one particular embodiment of Sheena for generating user profiles, the embodiment discussed in col. 4. However, in the rejection, Examiner provided citations to another embodiment described by Sheena for generating user profiles, which is in col. 5. Applicant did not argue the citations provided by Examiner to teach a sparse unary ratings matrix. As such, Examiner maintains that Sheena does disclose a user's selected preferences are represented as binary data in said sparse unary ratings matrix in col. 5, lines 2-17 (where item profiles are generated from user profiles, where the user profiles include either an item rating or no rating and where the rating data is stored in a matrix). Accordingly, the disclosure of Sheena in col. 5, lines 2-17 and col. 11, lines 58-67 seems to be in direct agreement with Applicant's definition of unary ratings data in which there are only two types of information: positive and no information (top of page 11 of Remarks), where Examiner is equating positive information to be any rating given by the user for an item and no information to be that the user has not rated an item. Additionally, Figure 2 illustrates how user's ratings of items either exist (i.e., positive information) or do not exist (i.e., no information). The remainder of Applicant's definition of unary ratings data that

Art Unit: 3623

discusses the values as either zero or one is not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found persuasive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-7, 11-17 and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,e) as being anticipated by Sheena et al. (U.S. 6,049,777).

As per claim 1, Sheena et al. discloses a method of preparing a recommendation to be accessed by a user comprising the steps of:

generating a sparse unary ratings matrix from the user's selected preferences, wherein said user's selected preferences are represented as binary data in said sparse unary ratings matrix (col. 5, lines 2-17; col. 11, lines 58-67; Figure 2; The system discloses using a sparse unary ratings matrix based on determining whether or not a

user has rated an item, where a rating would be indicated by a positive value and no rating would be indicated by no value. This illustration reads on Applicant's definition of what is meant by "unary data" on page 12 of their Specification, where it states that "unary data indicates a ratings data in which there are only two types of information: positive and no information." Additionally, in col. 8, lines 41-46, Sheena et al. discloses using 1 to indicate that the user has rated the item and 0 to indicate that the user has not rated the item.);

forming a plurality of data structures representing said sparse ratings matrix (col. 3, lines 40-57; col. 4, lines 56-67; The sparse ratings matrix is comprised of sparse vectors that represent item profiles and user profiles, where the item profiles include ratings on the items and the user profiles include users' ratings of the items.);

forming a runtime recommendation model from said plurality of data structures (col. 8, line 41-col. 9, line 56; Several similarity models are used to determine recommendations for users.);

determining a recommendation from said runtime recommendation model in response to a request for a recommendation (col. 6, lines 32-33 and 48-62; col. 7, lines 1-8 and 35-38; col. 8, line 28-col. 9, line 56; col. 10, lines 21-23; col. 13, lines 6-9; col. 26, line 66-col. 27, line 1; col. 27, lines 18-22; Several similarity models are used to determine recommendations for users. Requested data objects retrieve profiles that match the criteria from a user's request for a recommendation.); and

providing said recommendation in response to said request (col. 6, lines 32-33 and 48-62; col. 7, lines 1-8 and 35-38; col. 10, lines 21-23; col. 11, lines 45-55; col. 13,

lines 6-9; col. 26, line 66-col. 27, line 1; col. 27, lines 18-22; item 110 in Figures 1 and 3; Recommendations are provided to users. Requested data objects retrieve profiles that match the criteria from a user's request for a recommendation.).

As per claim 2, Sheena et al. discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising calculating a unary multiplicity voting recommendation from said runtime recommendation model (col. 8, lines 41-46; col. 11, lines 30-32; col. 16, lines 22-33; Zeros and ones (i.e., unary numbers) are used in the recommendation models.).

As per claim 3, Sheena et al. discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising calculating a non-unary multiplicity voting recommendation from said runtime recommendation model (col. 10, lines 5-15; col. 17, lines 4-6; Numbers between zero and one or greater than one (i.e., binary numbers) are used in the recommendation models.).

As per claim 4, Sheena et al. discloses the method of claim 2, wherein said calculating a unary multiplicity voting recommendation comprises calculating an anonymous recommendation (col. 3, lines 22-23; A user profile may represent more than one user, thus maintaining the anonymity of the individual users.).

As per claim 5, Sheena et al. discloses the method of claim 2, wherein calculating a unary multiplicity voting recommendation comprises calculating a personalized recommendation (col. 3, lines 36-38; col. 24, lines 58-60).

As per claim 6, Sheena et al. discloses the method of claim 3, wherein calculating a non-unary multiplicity voting recommendation comprises calculating an

anonymous recommendation (col. 3, lines 22-23; A user profile may represent more than one user, thus maintaining the anonymity of the individual users.).

As per claim 7, Sheena et al. discloses the method of claim 3, wherein calculating a non-unary multiplicity voting recommendation comprises calculating a personalized recommendation (col. 3, lines 36-38; col. 24, lines 58-60).

As per claim 11, Sheena et al. discloses a method of preparing a user recommendation comprising:

generating a sparse unary ratings matrix, wherein said sparse unary ratings matrix includes ratings data represented as binary data (col. 5, lines 2-17; col. 11, lines 58-67; Figure 2; The system discloses using a sparse unary ratings matrix based on determining whether or not a user has rated an item, where a rating would be indicated by a positive value and no rating would be indicated by no value. This illustration reads on Applicant's definition of what is meant by "unary data" on page 12 of their Specification, where it states that "unary data indicates a ratings data in which there are only two types of information: positive and no information." Additionally, in col. 8, lines 41-46, Sheena et al. discloses using 1 to indicate that the user has rated the item and 0 to indicate that the user has not rated the item.);

providing an update ratings data structure (col. 3, lines 30-33; col. 7, lines 54-65);

forming a plurality of data structures representing said sparse unary ratings matrix (col. 3, lines 40-57; col. 4, lines 56-67; The sparse ratings matrix is comprised of sparse vectors that represent item profiles and user profiles, where the item profiles include ratings on the items and the user profiles include users' ratings of the items.



Additionally, in col. 8, lines 41-46, Sheena et al. discloses using 1 to indicate that the user has rated the item and 0 to indicate that the user has not rated the item.);

forming a runtime recommendation model from said plurality of data structures and said update ratings data structure (col. 8, line 41-col. 9, line 56; Several similarity models are used to determine recommendations for users.);

determining a recommendation from said runtime recommendation model in response to a request for a recommendation (col. 6, lines 32-33 and 48-62; col. 7, lines 1-8 and 35-38; col. 8, line 28-col. 9, line 56; col. 10, lines 21-23; col. 13, lines 6-9; col. 26, line 66-col. 27, line 1; col. 27, lines 18-22; Several similarity models are used to determine recommendations for users. Requested data objects retrieve profiles that match the criteria from a user's request for a recommendation.); and

providing said recommendation in response to said request (col. 6, lines 32-33 and 48-62; col. 7, lines 1-8 and 35-38; col. 10, lines 21-23; col. 11, lines 45-55; col. 13, lines 6-9; col. 26, line 66-col. 27, line 1; col. 27, lines 18-22; item 110 in Figures 1 and 3; Recommendations are provided to users. Requested data objects retrieve profiles that match the criteria from a user's request for a recommendation.).

Claims 12-17 and 36-41 recite subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected above in claims 1-7 and 11. Therefore, claims 12-17 and 36-41 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-7 and 11 above.

Additionally, with regard to independent claims 36 and 41, Sheena et al. discloses applying the sparse vectors/arrays (i.e., the user profiles and the item profiles) to several numbers of recommendation models that use zero and non-zero entries, thereby using a first recommendation model and a second recommendation model (col. 3, lines 34-57; col. 19, lines 50-50; col. 20).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheena et al. (U.S. 6,049,777) and Schwinger, Julian, "The Geometry of Quantum States," Feb. 15, 1960.

As per claim 8, Sheena et al. discloses wherein forming a runtime recommendation model from said plurality of data structures comprises: mapping each rated item in the sparse unary ratings matrix to a category (col. 15, lines 3-11 and 18-23).

Sheena et al. does not expressly disclose wherein said mapping step comprises multiplying said unary ratings matrices by a mappings matrix between said unary ratings matrices and a plurality of categories.

Schwinger discloses multiplying matrices by a mappings matrix in order to map the matrices to that matrix (middle of page 260, "The product of an operator with a vector expresses a mapping upon another vector in the same space..."). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sheena et al. to use matrix multiplication as disclosed in Schwinger to map the rated items in the sparse unary ratings matrix to a category because doing so is a standard way in the art to map matrix data and also, because using a mathematical formula to map the matrix provides an efficient and effective means for mapping data, thereby enhancing Sheena et al.'s current means of mapping data.

Claim 18 recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected above in claim 8. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected on the same basis as claim 8 above.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Baum et al. (U.S. 5,023,833) discusses converting unary output to binary code.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Tarae whose telephone number is 571-272-6727. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 571-272-6729.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/C. Michelle Tarae/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623

February 14, 2008